

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed July 16, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1-19 were pending and rejected claims 1-19. Claims 1, 4, 9, 12, 16, 18 and 19 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, new claim 20 has been added; and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-20 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections and objections are respectfully traversed below

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-12, 14 and 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,772,150 (Whitman).

Whitman is related to a search query refinement using related search phrases. Specifically, Whitman describes a search engine system using information about historical query submissions to a search engine to suggest previously submitted, related search phrases to users (see Whitman, Abstract). Regarding independent claim 1, the Office Action asserted that Whitman discloses:

transforming said data of said plurality of documents into information to indicate said plurality of documents...in a first display form and to enable said user to select a display item to be utilized as a second search condition in a following processing...extracting data of documents corresponding to said display item selected by said user

(see Office Action, page 2, line 18 to page 3, line 3).

However, amended claim 1 recites:

"searching a predetermined document group according to a first search condition specified by a user to extract data of a plurality of documents...transforming said data of plurality of documents into information to indicate...to said user in a first display form and enable said user to select a display item to be utilized as a second search condition in a following processing...extracting data of documents corresponding to said display item **selected by said user from said storage or said data of said plurality of documents;**"

(claim 1, lines 9-17, emphasis is added) which is supported by the embodiments of the invention on page 14, lines 23-27 of the Specification.

It is respectfully submitted that Whitman does not teach or suggest the aforementioned features of claim 1. Rather, Whitman describes:

using information about historical query submissions to a search engine to suggest previously submitted to suggest previously-submitted, related search phrases to users. The related search phrases are preferably suggested based on a most recent set of query submissions data...and thus strongly reflect the current searching patterns or interests of users...**a table generation component uses information about prior query submissions to generate a table...that links key terms to previously-submitted search phrases containing such key**

terms. These "related search phrases"...selected...In the table using a scoring algorithm which scores the search phrases at least one of the following: (i) frequency of search phrase submission, (ii) number of matches found in response to search phrase submissions, and (iii) actions performed by users with respect to search results on search phrases submission

(see Whitman, col. 2, lines 13-35, emphasis is added). Therefore, Whitman neither teaches nor suggests "extracting data of documents corresponding to said display item selected by said user from said storage or said data of said plurality of documents", as recited in claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Whitman.

Amended claims 16 and 18 recite "extracting (extracts) data of documents corresponding to said display item selected by said user from said storage or said data of said plurality of documents;" where the parenthetical are used in claim 18 in place of the words preceding the parenthetical. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 16 and 18 patentably distinguish over Whitman.

Further, the dependent claims patentably distinguish over Whitman for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims. Moreover, dependent claims 2, 17, and 19 recite additional patentably distinguishing features of their own. Specifically, Whitman fails to disclose "the second...third...fourth...fifth form" and "receiving, before said second transforming, information concerning said second display form specified by said user" as recited in claims 2, 17, and 19. Further, Whitman neither teaches nor suggests "said second display form specified by the user," rather describes receiving a "related search phrase" selected by a user. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 17, and 19 further patentably distinguish over Whitman for their own additional features as discussed above.

On page 11 of the Office Action, claims 13 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,772,150 (Whitman). As discussed above, the dependent claims 13 and 15 patentably distinguish over Whitman for at least the same reasons as their base claim.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of all rejections.

New claim 20 has been added to recite:

extracting data selected by a user from a plurality of documents stored as a predetermined document group by searching the predetermined document group based on a search condition;

transforming the data from the plurality of documents stored in the predetermined document group into information to the user that enables the user to select a search result as a following search condition to search the predetermined document group based on the following search condition; and

outputting a transformed search result.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Whitman does not teach or suggest the aforementioned features of new claim 20. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 20 patentably distinguishes over Whitman.

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 16, 2007

By:   
Sheetal S. Patel  
Registration No. 59,326

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501